

REMARKS

Support for the Amendments can be found in the original claims and the prior amendments. Applicants' response filed 13 July 2008 is hereby incorporated by reference, except that the Amendments to the Claims section is superseded by that section as filed herewith.

For convenience and completeness, the continuation Sheet of the Office Action is set forth below in italics, with Applicants' remarks interspersed.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because. While the proposed amendments would overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs, made in the Office action mailed 05/14/2008.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that the prior amendments overcame the 35 USC 112 objections.

the amendment will not be entered for at least the following reason: claim 10 has been amended to be an independent claim. Claim 10 had previously been rejected over Verdine et al (see Office action mailed 09/19/2007). In response to that rejection, Applicant amended claim 1, from which claim 10 depended, to require either thermal denaturation/renaturation, alkaline denaturation or the use of restriction enzymes yielding singlestranded overhangs. Therefore, claim 10 would also require one of these steps to be performed. Since Verdine did not teach any of these steps, the rejection was withdrawn (see page 2 of the Office action mailed 05/14/2008). In Applicant's submission on 07/13/2008, however, claim 10 has been amended to remove dependency on claim 1, and recites the option of "chaotropic agents", which in fact was taught by Verdine. Since claim 10 no longer requires one of thermal denaturation/renaturation, alkaline denaturation or the use of restriction enzymes yielding single-stranded overhangs, claim 10 as proposed would require further search and consideration, and might result in a reinstatement of the rejection based on Verdine

Claim 10 has been further amended herein [as shown in boldface] to require either thermal denaturation/renaturation, alkaline denaturation or the use of restriction enzymes yielding single-stranded overhangs, to conform to Claim 1 in this respect. There are no other amendments.

The \$405.00 RCE fee:

1801/2801	37 CFR 1.17(e)	Request for continued examination (RCE) (see 37 CFR 1.114)	810.00	\$405.00
-----------	----------------	--	--------	----------


and any other necessary (small entity) charges can be charged to USPTO Deposit Account 200336 of Technology Licensing Co. LLC. Correspondence may be addressed to Customer No. 26830.

The Examiner is especially invited to telephone Applicants' Attorney if that would expedite prosecution and disposal of this Application.

USN10/737.403 Docket 015AUS of USPTO Cust. 26830

Page 7 of 9

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Coale Willson, Jr.

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 22,080

USPTO Customer 26830

Technology Licensing Co. LLC

3205 Harvest Moon Ste 200

Palm Harbor FL 34683

Telephone - 727 781 0089

Fax: 727 785 8435

E-mail: rwillso@aol.com

Enclosures: RCE Form SB30, (No Clean claims required)

015AUSHandlcsRCE20080804F